

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of HIJUNO WATSON, JR.,  
DEANGLO RAWSHAWN WATSON, JALEN  
MEKHI WATSON, DA'MARCA OMINIC  
DARNELL LEASTER, and TYREAKE CORTEZ  
LEASTER, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

HIJUNO J. WATSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

SHAKOOR Z. MYRICK,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
September 30, 2003

No. 241388  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 98-370493

Before: Murphy, P.J., and Cooper and C. L. Levin\*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

Petitioner has the burden of establishing a statutory ground for termination under MCL 712A.19b(3) by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). If that burden is satisfied, "the court must issue an order terminating parental rights unless there exists clear evidence, on the whole record, that termination is not in the child's best interests." *Id.* at 354; MCL 712A.19b(3)(5). This Court reviews the trial court's decision for clear error. *In re Trejo*, *supra* at 356.

---

\* Former Supreme Court justice, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. Termination was warranted under § 19b(c)(i) in light of the evidence that respondent was still without suitable housing for the children, and did not have a source of income to support them. Respondent also failed to fully engage in services designed to address his substance abuse problem. Additionally, there was evidence that respondent abused and mistreated the children while they were in his care, and then failed to participate in services to address this issue. Accordingly, termination was also appropriate under §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j).

Finally, the evidence failed to show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper

/s/ Charles L. Levin